

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fridababy, LLC v. 鲁旺龙

Case No. D2025-3932

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Fridababy, LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Abion AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is 鲁旺龙, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <fridababysoftlife.com> is registered with Beijing Zhuoyue Shengming Technologies Company Ltd. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 26, 2025. On September 29, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 30, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent (N/A) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 30, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed the amended Complaints on October 2 and 6, 2025 respectively.

On September 30, 2025, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. On October 2, 2025, the Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant's submission.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaints satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Policy" or "UDRP"), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Rules"), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Supplemental Rules").

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on October 6, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 26, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on November 6, 2025.

The Center appointed Karen Fong as the sole panelist in this matter on November 10, 2025. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panel has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by the Center to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant, based in the United States, was established in 2016. It specializes in developing and selling products in the field of baby care, pregnancy and fertility under the brands FRIDA, FRIDA BABY, FRIDA MOM and FRIDA FERTILITY. The Complainant's products can be found in more than 50 countries and in over 40,000 stores in the United States. The Complaint uses its FRIDA mark in a stylized form in a turquoise blue colour (the "Logo") on its products, packaging and communications.

The Complainant's products are manufactured by suppliers around the world including China. The Complainant owns many domain names including <frida.com>, <fridababy.com>, <fridababy.us>, <fridababy.co> which all resolve to the Complainant's main website at "www.frida.com".

The FRIDA and FRIDA BABY trade marks are registered in many jurisdictions including:

- United States Trade Mark Registration No. 5155772 for FRIDA BABY registered on March 7, 2017;
- Chinese Trade Mark Registration No. 29398117 for FRIDA BABY registered on December 28, 2018; and
- International Trade Mark Registration No. 1591897 for FRIDA registered on December 17, 2020;

(individually and collectively, the "Trade Mark").

The Respondent who appears to be based in China registered the disputed domain name on December 5, 2024. The disputed domain name was connected to a website which displayed the Trade Mark and the Logo prominently, mimicked the Complainant's own website including using its product images, content, other registered trade marks and purportedly offers for sale merchandise that bears the Trade Mark at discounted prices and purports to be the Complainant's products (the "Website"). The Website is currently inactive after the Complainant filed a take down notice.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trade Mark, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name, and that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Preliminary Issue: Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for the following main reasons:

- The disputed domain name is composed of Latin characters and incorporates English words;
- The Website is in English which indicates that the Respondent understands English;
- The Complainant is based in the United States and is unable to understand Chinese;
- English is the language used most commonly and internationally; and
- Having to translate the Complaint into Chinese would entail significant additional costs for the Complainant and delay the proceeding.

The Respondent has not challenged the Complainant's language request and in fact has failed to file a response in either English or Chinese despite being duly notified by the Center in both English and Chinese of the language of the proceeding and of the commencement of the proceeding.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.5.1).

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

6.2. Substantive Issues

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

It is well accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trade mark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the entirety of the Trade Mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trade Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

While the addition of the words “soft” and “life” after the Trade Mark may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of the words does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Trade Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

While the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the often impossible task of “proving a negative”, requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. As such, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant’s prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Moreover, the nature of the disputed domain name is inherently misleading as it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular but without limitation, that if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent must have been aware of the Trade Mark when he/she registered the disputed domain name given the Trade Mark was registered prior to registration of the disputed domain name and the use of the Trade Mark and Logo on the Website. It is therefore implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant when he/she registered the disputed domain name.

In the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2 states as follows:

“Noting the near instantaneous and global reach of the Internet and search engines, and particularly in circumstances where the complainant’s mark is widely known (including in its sector) or highly specific and a respondent cannot credibly claim to have been unaware of the mark (particularly in the case of domainers), panels have been prepared to infer that the respondent knew, or have found that the respondent should have known, that its registration would be identical or confusingly similar to a complainant’s mark. Further factors including the nature of the domain name, the chosen top-level domain, any use of the domain name, or any respondent pattern, may obviate a respondent’s claim not to have been aware of the complainant’s mark.”

The fact that there is a clear absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with the Respondent's choice of the disputed domain name without any explanation is also a significant factor to consider (as stated in [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1). The disputed domain name falls into the category stated above and the Panel finds that registration is in bad faith. The addition of the words "soft" and "life" after the Trade Mark further indicates that the Respondent had actual knowledge of and was targeting the Complainant when registering the disputed domain name given the fact that the additional words are descriptive of the Complainant's goods.

The disputed domain name is also being used in bad faith. The unauthorised use of the product images and content from the Complainant's website, the Trade Mark, the Logo and the discounted goods on offer are clear indications of use for potentially illegal activity.

The Website has prominently displayed the Trade Mark, without any disclaimer disclosing (the lack of) relationship between the Parties. The content of the Website is calculated to give the impression it has been authorised by or connected to the Complainant when this is not the case. The Website was set up to deliberately mislead Internet users into believing that it is connected to, authorised by or affiliated with the Complainant. From the above, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, by misleading Internet users into believing that the Website was, and the products sold on it were those of or authorised or endorsed by the Complainant.

It is highly likely that Internet users when typing the disputed domain name into their browser or finding it through a search engine would have been looking for a site operated by the Complainant rather than the Respondent. The disputed domain name is likely to confuse Internet users trying to find the Complainant's official website. Such confusion will inevitably arise due to the fact that the disputed domain name comprises the Trade Mark in its entirety.

The fact that the disputed domain name is now inactive does not prevent a finding of bad faith given that the distinctiveness of the Trade Mark, the composition of the disputed domain name and the lack of a response from the Respondent.

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <fridababysoftlife.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Karen Fong/

Karen Fong

Sole Panelist

Date: December 3, 2025